



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Post reditum in senatu*, *Post reditum ad Quirites*, *De domo sua ad Pontifices*, and *De haruspicum responso* (-is)—and an equally short discussion of the Codex Parisinus (P) and the relation of the rest of the manuscripts (B, Σ, G, E, H, b, b<sup>2</sup>, c, k, s) to it. He argues in favor of the genuineness of the controverted four speeches and bases his text, with but few conjectures, on P.

With the publication of Mr. Clark's small volume the Oxford edition of Cicero is completed. This editor's scholarship has contributed much to establishing the text of Cicero, and this latest contribution will be welcomed by all students of the great orator.

He devotes a considerable part of his introduction to the interesting story of Petrarch, his Ciceronian studies, his zeal in copying and diffusing manuscripts of his works. He establishes two families of Cicero manuscripts—a German and a French. The former, including T, E, G, ε, π, is at almost every point superior in quality, though the latter family boasts a larger number.

In keeping with the general plan of the series, a brief critical apparatus with the most important variant readings is found at the bottom of each page.

WALTER MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

*Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Julius Brix. Zweites Bändchen: Captivi. Sechste Auflage bearbeitet von MAX NIEMEYER. Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1910. Pp. 117. M. 1.40.*

Niemeyer has now thrice revised Brix's well-known edition of the *Captivi*. Formerly, he was restrained, he says, by *Pietät*; now the revision "ist . . . gründlicher gewesen." He is still, however, profoundly impressed by Brix's acumen and scholarship, and gives generous attention, in the *Anhang*, to his views.

In this revision the *Einleitung* has been entirely rewritten, and the commentary has been brought up to date. Thus, there are references in the commentary to the recently discovered fragments of Menander. Again, much space is given to the views set forth in S. Sudhaus' *Der Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica*, published at Leipzig in 1909. To the cantica of the *Captivi* Niemeyer has enthusiastically applied Sudhaus' schemes; in his brief *Vorwort* he exclaims: "Und siehe da, ich fand sein Gesetz über den Stollenbau durchaus bewährt." He sent his results for the *Captivi* to Sudhaus, and found, to his delight, that Sudhaus had reached the same conclusions; in all this he sees striking confirmation of Sudhaus' theories. Attention may, however, be called here to Leo's objections to these theories, voiced in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* for 1911.

The *Einleitung* covers only 10 pages. There is no discussion here of the meters; in this respect the book is far less valuable, even when reinforced by the treatment of the meters in Niemeyer's edition of the *Trinummus*, 14-25, than Lindsay's *editio maior* of the *Captivi* (London: Methuen, 1900), with its masterly survey of the meters, 12-102, which gives control to tyro and scholar both of all the work done on Plautine meters up to that time. The comparison of the two books here is not unfair, since "Bücher für den Schulgebrauch erklärt," such as Brix's editions of the plays of Plautus and Dziatsko's of those of Terence, are in reality works of high scholarship, making real contributions. In his brief outline of the plot, on p. 1, Niemeyer tries, unsuccessfully, I think, to meet one criticism of the plot of the *Captivi*. He asserts that such exchange of identity as we have in our play must have been common enough: "Ein vornehmer Gefangener war ein Kapital. Da galt es zu überlisten; solche Verabredungen zwischen Krieger und Waffenträger mochten wohl vorkommen." But, I ask, assuming that our captives could have foreseen Hegio's proposal, where lay the profit of such *Verabredung* for them? Here we have no effort whatever at *Ueberlistung*: Philocrates keeps his bargain faithfully. We had better accept the device of the exchange of identities as one that leads to very pleasing results, however little it will bear coldly logical examination. Niemeyer rates the *Captivi* highly; he does not refer to Professor Morris' suggestion (Introduction, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii) that Plautus had sadly misconceived his original, and had in particular vulgarized the character of Hegio. On pp. 4-5 Niemeyer discusses Plautus' disregard of geographical accuracy; he might have referred to my remarks in *Classical Philology*, II, 14, note 1. There are, further, interesting remarks on the relation of Plautus to his original; the genuineness of the prologue to the *Captivi* is defended, in particular against Ritschl's arguments based on the theory that there were no seats in the theater in Plautus' time. In the account of the editions of the *Captivi* there is one very curious omission: no reference is made to Lindsay's text ("Oxford Classical Text Series"), published in 1903.

There is not space here, unfortunately, to discuss the notes throughout in detail. A good commentary has been improved; there is a long array of excellent notes, and an equally long array of notes that, whether they command assent or not, will stimulate thought. I shall confine myself, in the rest of this review, to the passages of which Niemeyer has made special mention in his preface.

In 201 Niemeyer reads (CA. *Oh Oh Oh*) LO. *Eivulatione haud opus est: oculis aciem minuitis*. Brix had read *oculis multam iram editis*. The MSS give *multa oculis multa miraculitis*. Evidently palaeographical considerations do not trouble Niemeyer. Because in *Aul.* 795 *ei mihi* is followed by *cur eiulas?* and in *Mer.* 624 *heu me miserum!* is followed by *omite flere*, Niemeyer concludes "also ist bei *eivulatio* wohl auch an Tränen gedacht." But a reference to weeping by our captives comports ill with their bearing

throughout the play; see especially 262. The phrases cited by Niemeyer in support of his *oculis aciem minuitis* do not help him at all. That Plautus' phraseology must be respected in emendation even Professor Lindsay needed to learn; in *Truc.* 804, following Kampmann, he reads a form of *dono donare*: Plautus' phrase, as Professor Lodge's *Lexicon Plautinum* has shown, is invariably *dono dare* (20 examples). In *Cap.* 201 the reading in Lindsay's *editio maior*, *oculis multa mira aitis*, is less bad than Niemeyer's, though I cannot believe it Plautine.

In 215 B-17 Niemeyer reads TY. *Obnoxii ambo vobis sumus propter hanc rem, quom, quae volumus nos, copias, ea <fide> facitis nos compotes.* Lindsay (*editio maior*, Oxford Text) had all this except *fide*; Goetz-Schoell mark the last line as corrupt. Here again I cannot follow Niemeyer, who merely says: "ea fide, quam concedendo, abeundo praestatis." Why insert words so freely? Further, how does the notion of good faith find an entrance here? The captives have been in no position to strike bargains or exact promises.

In 772 Niemeyer reads *Nec quoquam homini supplicare <nec deo> nunc certumst mihi.* Editors have long sought to alter this line, in accordance with their theories of the meter. Brix, after Geppert, had changed *nunc* to *nunciam*; Lindsay, *editio maior*, has proved this change inadmissible. I do not think any change needed. Certainly, Niemeyer's is inadvisable; it imports into the parasite's words a defiance of heaven he shows nowhere else in the play, and which is not justified by the context. If the MSS gave *nec deo*, then indeed we could readily see with Niemeyer a fine *Steigerung* and a contrast to the thanks just given to *Iuppiter supremus*. But, as the text stands, we get an even finer contrast, that between the helpful *Iuppiter supremus* who has so substantially aided Ergasilus—and *mere man*, to whom he surely bowed the knee before (see his long lament on that subject in 461-97) but to whom hereafter he will render no homage.

In 880-82 Niemeyer reads HE. *Et servolum (sc. vidisti) meum Stalagmum, meum qui gnatum surrupuit?* ER. Ναὶ τὰν Κόπαν. HE. *Iam <ho> die. . . .* ER. Ναὶ τὰν Πραυνέστην. HE. Venit? ER. Ναὶ τὰν Σκυρίαν. HE. Certon'? ER. Ναὶ τὰν Φρυσινῶνα. HE. Vide sis. The MSS give *iam diu*. Editors commonly supply with *iam diu* the verb *venit*. But this can have no meaning. If *venit* is to be supplied at all, then Professor Morris was right in declaring the text corrupt. Niemeyer's text means (he too supplies *venit*), "Is he come back so soon?" By "he" Niemeyer understands Philocrates! On this arbitrary and wrong procedure he bases the following comment: "So fragen wir alle mit dem beglückten Vater, doch—den Poeten bindet keine Zeit." He might have referred to the short passage in the introduction (p. 3), in which he declares that he emended in 882 to make it plain that Plautus himself was aware of the one downright impossibility in the play—the return of Philocrates on the same day: "Das wird auch durch die Ungläubigkeit des Hegio und durch einen überreichen Schwurapparat des Bearbeiters prächtig und gründlich unterstrichen." To all this

there are many answers. Plautus cared nothing at all about such matters. His indifference to matters of art everybody knows; if illustration of it must be had, see e.g., my remarks in *Classical Philology*, II, 14, note 1, II, 6, note 1. Further, after 880–81, *Stalagmum meum qui gnatum surrupuit?* the only possible subject of the verb *venit* in 882, as read by Niemeyer, is, not Philocrates at all, but *Stalagmus*. Between Philopolemus and his father's thoughts two other personalities have come—*Stalagmus* and the boy lost twenty years before. *Iam hodie <Stalagmus venit>*, "Has *Stalagmus* come back so soon?" is wildly absurd. To the father's heart the twenty years of *Stalagmus*' absence had been a long, long time (compare the implications of the prologue and of 759 ff.). There is also a grievous psychological flaw in Niemeyer's text and introduction. Plautus knew humanity, if he did disregard art; he knew too well the soul of a father bereft to make him think, when face to face with a great and unexpected joy, the recovery of a long-lost son, of the trifling and irrelevant question of the possibility or impossibility of making a given journey in a given time.

It is, moreover, entirely possible to keep the manuscript reading. Professor Elmer nearly saw the truth. He gave the traditional text, but had the acumen to connect *iam diu* with the preceding *surrupuit*. Let us bring this out by proper punctuation, by putting a dash after *surrupuit*, instead of a question mark; Ergasilus cuts in while Hegio is speaking. The effectiveness of the passage could be brought out far more easily in acting than on the printed page. What Niemeyer has to say about the *Schwurapparat* applies equally well to the manuscript text, as just interpreted.

On 912 A (912 B in Niemeyer), which is given only in A, in a sadly corrupt state, Lindsay, *editio maior*, remarks that Studemund showed that in this part of the *Captivi* A had many more verses, perhaps forty more than appear here in the other manuscripts. In 911 ff. Niemeyer inserts two whole verses; in 912 (912 B in his numbering) he inserts several words, making the verse readable. In 912 B his text strikes me as unhappy, in that it produces a very ineffective hysteron proteron. The insertion of verses to fill up the gap in A in this part of the play is an entertaining exercise for those who like that sort of thing, but the results are not likely to carry conviction to others. If anyone doubts this, let him compare the readings of *Cap.* 907, before the Ambrosian palimpsest was clearly deciphered here, with the text of that verse as now given in all the editions!! See Halledie *ad loc.*

CHARLES KNAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

---

*Études sur le style des Discours de Cicéron.* Avec une esquisse de l'histoire du "Cursus." Par L. LAURAND. Paris: Hachette. Pp. xxxix+388. Fr. 7.50.

In the first of the three books into which this work is divided the author examines the language of Cicero's speeches; in the second, his use of clausulae;